

Tempe Municipal Court



State of the Court

**Presented to Mayor and Council
by Presiding Judge
Louraine C. Arkfeld.**

February 2007



INTRODUCTION

This is the thirteenth annual State of the Court message presented to Mayor and Council. We established this tradition to provide you with the current status of the Court by sharing information on our overall operations and performance including accomplishments, revenues, expenditures, and budget issues as well as our future goals.

We continue our commitment to the administration of quality justice in the most cost effective manner possible for the citizens of Tempe. As always, we welcome any feedback from Mayor and Council about our efforts.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Operational Effectiveness

- Construction of the Court's new jury assembly room and arraignment courtroom was completed in March 2006. The training area has allowed a much more comfortable, user friendly location for jurors while the arraignment courtroom provides a space that will handle a much larger volume of court users. In addition, the space also serves as a staff training room for Court employees. In light of Court turnover, this has been an invaluable resource.
- This year was the third full year of the Mental Health Court. From the program's inception, November 4, 2003 through December 31, 2006, 145 people have been placed in the Mental Health Court, 79 people have successfully completed the program; and seven have returned due to committing new misdemeanor offenses. Presently there are 22 participants; three are homeless and five have co-occurring disorders. The Mental Health Court has offered a diversion option for the seriously mentally ill and also aided them in accessing various services in an effort to provide greater stability and lessen the likelihood of this population committing new criminal offenses. It should be noted that the Mental Health Court has also had nine participants who have suffered from developmental disabilities. These individuals were all case managed by the Department of Developmental Disabilities. Eight of the nine successfully graduated from the program.
- The Court continues to maintain the highest rate of filing per bench officer and non-judicial staff of any comparable municipal court in Maricopa County.
- The Court has reorganized its management structure and created a court trainer position via the reclassification of our management assistant position. The court trainer has been instrumental in assisting new employees in getting acclimated to their positions, revising procedures in preparation for our new case management system and developing curriculum to better serve our staff.
- An independent audit of the Arizona Supreme Court's Minimum Accounting Standards, Compliance Checklist and Guide for External Reviews for Arizona Courts found the Court to be in compliance with all standards.
- Tempe Municipal Court maintained operations despite a 64 percent turnover of line staff in Fiscal Year 2006.

Technology Improvements

- The Court is continuing its efforts to develop a case management system (CMS) to replace an aging legacy application. One major impetus for this effort is that the current application uses an HP e3000 server and plans have been announced that would end formal support of this device. Additionally, the development project utilizes leading edge technology sets that will position the Court to be at the technological forefront when the CMS is complete. Anticipated completion of Phase I of the CMS development is Summer 2007 with Court implementation Fall 2007. The City's Information Technology Department is spearheading the effort to migrate existing data from the legacy application into the development application. This project is a joint effort with the Arizona Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and is the result of an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Tempe and the AOC. To date, the State Judiciary's Commission on Technology has authorized \$500,000 in grant funding for this project. It is anticipated that the last installment of \$50,000 will be approved and received in February 2007.

Cost effectiveness

- In January 2006 the Court received three additional Court Service Specialist positions via contingency funds. These positions received permanent funding beginning Fiscal Year 06/07. While these additional positions have been a tremendous help to the Court, we continue to experience issues with workload and staff turnover. According to the most recent Arizona Supreme Court statistics, the percentage of filings per non-judicial staff in Tempe is 32 percent greater than the next highest court in Maricopa County.
- In Fiscal Year 05/06, the Court collected \$5,795,713 in revenues to the City. This figure was over 20 percent higher than projections for the fiscal year.

Customer Services

- Court management participated in effectiveness training to work more cohesively with one another.
- The Court installed assistive listening devices in all of the courtrooms as well as the jury-training assembly room. These devices allow the Court to make reasonable accommodations for individuals with hearing impairments.
- Judges and Court staff continue to participate in post academy orientation for new officers joining Tempe Police Department. This interactive session allows officers to ask questions about their role in the courtroom and receive technical training on court calendars, hearings etc. This training speaks to the Court's desire to ensure that the police and the Court communicate effectively and as a result, the community receives quality services.
- **Diversity Plan** - To ensure that the Court is actively supporting diversity, staff continue to review and offer input to the Court's diversity plan on an annual basis.

Community Outreach

- Court staff conducted a fourth successful Law Day with an art contest on “Liberty Under Law: Separate Branches, Balanced Powers” with entries from school children throughout the City of Tempe. The results were displayed at the City Council Chambers.
- The Court continues to host presentations on issues of the law to groups such as Tempe Leadership and other community organizations.
- Our Judges continue to provide education services to Tempe schools through the “Kids in Court” program. This program includes videos depicting scenarios in which minors might find themselves within the court system along with several exercises on government and leadership.
- Court employees provide multiple training classes and serve in leadership capacities for the Arizona Courts Association and the Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators Association.

DISCUSSION

First and foremost, the mission of this court is to provide effective and efficient justice for our community. That we do this with the limited number of staff that we have is truly remarkable. This Council is well aware of the staffing issues both in terms of numbers and turnover that we have previously brought to your attention. The addition of three new line level positions last year was critical and essential in maintaining our current level of operations and thus was very much appreciated. I wish I could say that this has resolved all of the staffing issues. We continue to operate with the highest number of filings per non-judicial employee of any municipal court within Maricopa County and not just slightly higher; but 32 percent greater than the next highest court.

In order to combat the stress that results from this constant high volume, we have made efforts to address staff issues both from the perspective of our employees and automation support. As it takes at least six months to adequately train new employees to perform their job functions, turnover places a tremendous demand on our ability to have well trained specialists working in the courtrooms and serving court customers. Because of the high staff turnover, there was a need for more constant and consistent training. So, with the help of Human Resources, we converted a management assistant position into a full-time trainer position. This is already reaping rewards. Staff turnover has been reduced and employees, even though relatively new,

are feeling a greater comfort level and increasing their job knowledge. These individuals recognize the importance of what they are doing and that mistakes could have a very serious impact on court users as well as our judicial and statutory responsibilities. It is a great stress reliever to feel confident that you are performing your duties correctly and that there is always someone to turn to when there is a question as to how to proceed. This positive feeling, of course, increases the overall morale of the staff and provides needed stability to the Court.

As has been noted, we also have the highest number of filings per bench officer of any municipal court. We have not added a bench position in over a decade but rather have focused our efforts on efficiencies at the staff level. While there has been a continuing increase in criminal case filings, there has been a slight decrease in civil filings. In an effort to maximize our flexibility we are currently proposing an ordinance that creates the position of commissioner. While primarily expected to hear civil violations, the commissioner will also have the authority to hear criminal cases on an as-needed basis. We are not asking for a new position but rather will convert one of our existing hearing officer positions to this commissioner position. That way we will not lose our ability to handle all of our civil matters but rather will gain back-up for needs in our criminal division including either coverage of the in-custody calendar, which is typically handled by a pro-tem judge, or coverage for a full-time judge who is absent due to training, vacation or illness.

While this adjustment will address the current bench officer needs, it does not resolve the non-judicial staff shortages and I will be asking for an additional four staff positions in the upcoming budget cycle. Even with these four additional staff, we will continue to have the highest number of filings per non-judicial staff – still 18 percent greater than the next highest court - but it brings us closer to what is the operative norm in high-volume courts. I should note that a significant number of our staff left for other positions within the city which they cited as less stressful and demanding. Additional positions will not only make the workload much more manageable on a day-to-day basis, but also give us flexibility to allow for coverage when staff are absent for various reasons. Currently more than one absence usually results in a supervisor having to assume line-level duties – and even Deputy Court Managers can be found answering phones and waiting on the front counter. While it is wonderful that we have a management team

that is committed to serving the public and doing whatever it takes to get the job done, this is truly not an efficient way to run an organization on a daily basis.

The request for additional staffing is also triggered by the request for additional positions within the Police Department. As I am sure you recognize, the criminal justice system is just that, a system. A significant increase of sworn officers results in a substantial increase in filings and a concurrent increased workload within the Court. To keep the system effective and providing appropriate levels of service to both our internal and external customers, we need to have the staff that can handle these higher levels.

The Court has made progress towards completion and then implementation of our new Case Management System. Because our focus is always to involve the end user with the development of the product, there is a great deal of staff participation in testing and reviewing as we progress. Implementation and the concurrent necessary training also will be a big undertaking this year. We have every confidence that the end result will be a case management system that not only contains current functionality but also markedly improves upon it. It will also provide a solid platform for future enhancements to streamline our work processes even more. Because it is anticipated that this system will be a candidate for most limited jurisdiction courts throughout Arizona, there will be support for the development of these enhancements, from not only the Administrative Office of the Courts, but other limited jurisdiction courts as well.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the impact that construction has had on the parking situation for the Court- both for our customers and our employees. We no longer have parking available for any court customers adjoining the Court due to the construction of the Transit Center. Nor will this parking return when construction is completed. Security statistics show that an average of 700 people a day access the Police Courts Building security entrance during normal business hours. Needless to say there is nowhere near that kind of parking available anywhere nearby. Court customers have to hope for access to the East City Hall lot across the street which is quite often full. Because of the search for parking, defendants may be late for scheduled court sessions. They are often coming and going from the courtroom to continually

pay their parking meters so as not to add to their pending cases. I would also point out that with the loss of court parking, court users have to park across from the Court and often take chances darting directly across the street from the lot to the court building rather than access the designated painted crosswalk. I realize the challenge of parking in a booming downtown that is next to a college campus. Yet, without a long term parking plan to accommodate both court users and court employees, we are not providing the customer service that Tempe residents have come to expect, while we also run the risk of injuries to pedestrian and automobile traffic. Additionally, the issue of court employees making a fifteen minute walk from the Chase lot to the Court has had an impact on employee morale.

This year concluded with a major change in the management team for the Court. In my thirteen-year tenure as the Presiding Judge, I have only had two Court Managers, both of whom left the position only because of retirement. Luckily, I had wonderful applicants from within our existing management team and I now have Mark Stodola as my new Court Manager. We have also filled his vacant Deputy Manager position with Nancy Rodriguez. She was previously with the Scottsdale Municipal Court and brings nineteen years of court experience to the job. These two, together with Rick Rager, an already outstanding deputy who is also the project manager for the development of the new case management system, give me a team that I know can face any issue this year will bring and I am fortunate to have each of them onboard.

CONCLUSION

In fact, I feel very fortunate to have the entire staff that I do and I am proud of each and every one of them. The accomplishments noted at the beginning of this document are a reflection of the hard work and commitment of each of these individuals. When I look at the attached list of goals for the year ahead, I have every confidence that next year I will be reporting their successful completion as well.

None of this of course would happen without the assistance and support of staff throughout the city. We receive excellent services from all departments. In particular, I am grateful to our partners within the Criminal Justice Working Group and to the Human Resources

Department who have provided so much support through all of our personnel changes. The Information Technology Department is a key player in our CMS project. It is extraordinary to work for a Mayor and Council that value excellence throughout its organization.

Our continuing goal is to provide a stable and progressive Court that serves this community by providing effective and efficient administration of justice. We all appreciate the opportunity to continue to serve Tempe.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment # 1 – Court Mission and Vision Statement
Attachment # 2 - 2007 Goals
Attachment # 3 – Maricopa County Municipal Courts Activity Statistics
Attachment # 4 – Workload Indicators, Criminal and Civil Divisions
Attachment # 5 – Budget Summary
Attachment # 6 – Revenue Summary
Attachment # 7 – Four-year Information Technology Financial Summary
Attachment # 8 – Security Statistics

COURT MANAGEMENT TEAM

Mark Stodola, *Court Manager*
Rick Rager, *Deputy Court Manager, Criminal Division, Automation Manager*
Nancy Rodriguez, *Deputy Court Manager, Civil Division, Budget Manager*
Christy Slover, *Court Services Supervisor, Court Services, Criminal Division*
Jennifer Dubois, *Court Services Supervisor, Court Services, Civil Division*
Jacque Frusetta, *Administrative Services Supervisor*
Alexis Allen, *Court Services Supervisor, Customer Services, Civil Division*
Frankie Valenzuela, *Court Trainer*
Jeanette Wiesenhofer, *Court Services Supervisor, Financial Services, Civil Division*

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

Mayor and City Council
Will Manley, *City Manager*
Jeff Kulaga, *Assistant City Manager*
Andrew Ching, *City Attorney*
Robert Hubbard, *City Prosecutor*
Jan Hort, *City Clerk*
Tom Ryff, *Chief of Police*
Laura Forbes, *Assistant Chief of Police*
David Lind, *Assistant Chief of Police*
Brenda Buren, *Fiscal/Research Administrator*
Ray Markwell, *Operations Support Administrator*
Valerie Hernandez, *Human Resources Manager*
Jon O'Connor, *Deputy Human Resources Manager*
Tom Canasi, *Community Services Manager*
Judy Tapscott, *Deputy Community Services Manager, Social Services*
Shelley Hearn, *Community Relations Manager*

Nikki Ripley, *Communication and Media Relations Director*
Jerry Hart, *Financial Services Manager*
Cecilia Velasco-Robles, *Deputy Financial Services Manager, Budget*
Deborah Bair, *Lead Budget and Research Analyst*
Tom Mikesell, *Budget and Research Analyst II*
Gene Obis, *Information Technology Manager*
Dave Heck, *Deputy Information Technology Manager*
Ted Hoffman, *Deputy Information Technology Manager*
Ron Smith, *Applications Supervisor*

JUDICIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Judy Aldrich
Thomas E. Klobas
Brad Tebow
Hon. Steven D. Sheldon
Margaret Stockton

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

Barbara Mundell, *Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Maricopa County*
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *Court Administrator, Maricopa County*
Karen Westover, *Court Administrator, Limited Jurisdictions Courts, Maricopa County*
David K. Byers, *Administrative Director, AOC, Supreme Court*
Janet Scheiderer, *Court Services Director, AOC, Supreme Court*

MISSION

To contribute to the quality of life in our community by fairly and impartially administering justice in the most effective, efficient, and professional manner possible.

VISION

Work together to serve the public.

Treat the public and each other with courtesy and respect.

Be ethical in all that we do.

Communicate honestly and openly.

Be sensitive and caring.

Welcome and value individual differences and diversity.

Reward well-intentioned and well-reasoned risk taking.

Praise and reward fully, discipline sparingly.

Be energetic and hard working.

Make every day in the Court both positive and productive.

2007 GOALS

- **Staff Development** - The Tempe Municipal Court has experienced significant turnover of Court Service Specialists. Two thirds of line level employees have less than one year of experience with our Court. The Court continues to place a strong emphasis on providing superior training for new employees along with cross training of our veteran staff.
- **Employee Morale** – Court employees have established a morale committee to recognize peers, plan social events and improve the Court culture. Court management strongly support these efforts and consider this an integral part of retaining and rewarding our employees.
- **Case Management System Development** - The Case Management System development is occurring in partnership with the Arizona Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Courts. An initial implementation is planned for the fourth quarter of 2007. Within the next year, the development efforts are focusing on the following areas:
 - All financial aspects (i.e. database design, receipting, payment contracts, disbursements, adjustments, collections, bonds, reporting, etc.).
 - Enforcement activities for non-compliance.
 - Petition entry including Orders of Protection and Injunctions against Harassment.
 - Electronic disposition reporting to the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Motor Vehicles.
 - Event-driven processing which precludes the user from having to memorize various codes for system processing.
 - General statistical reporting.
 - Calendaring/scheduling.
 - Work queues/processing.
 - Data conversion and migration.
 - System maintenance and error handling.

Based on current projections, code generation, testing and “debugging” along with data conversion should be complete by Summer 2007. Staff training will occur prior to implementation.

- **Handhelds/E-Complaint Issuance** - The Court's current case management system that is being replaced by the aforementioned development efforts includes a component that allows traffic enforcement aides to issue parking complaints via an electronic handheld unit. This functionality will be included in the development project. Recently, Tempe Police Department command staff expressed interest in possibly expanding the handheld e-complaint technology and utilizing within the traffic bureau for all complaints. This will be explored further in the coming months.
- **Telecommunication Technology and Maricopa County Jail** – In addition to Tempe, other courts and police departments have begun investigating the possible use of

teleconferencing to eliminate the need for transporting defendants. Such actions would increase public safety and possibly assist detention with current workload issues. A workable solution will require further communication between interested jurisdictions and the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office.

- **Customer Service/Training** - We continue to emphasize respect for and positive interaction with both internal and external court customers. Our court trainer will be providing employees both "in-house" educational opportunities in addition to pursuing trainings that help maximize the potential of our staff.
- **Criminal Justice System Connect** - Judges and Court staff continue to participate in post academy orientation for new officers joining Tempe Police Department. We will be looking at ways to work more efficiently with the police, social services and the prosecutors office to reduce operational redundancies.
- **Community Connect** - The Court continues to explore ways to interact with the citizens of Tempe. We welcome any opportunity to speak with civic groups about the Court's functions
- **Disaster Preparedness** - The Court is participating in the City of Tempe Business Continuity Plan as well as the coordination of a disaster recovery plan with the Maricopa County Superior Court. These plans are a major undertaking that require coordination with both the judicial and executive branch of government and require employees to work through a wide variety of scenarios that could impact the Court's ability to function.

MARICOPA COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT ACTIVITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005/2006

Comparing various workloads, output, and productivity measures of select municipal courts in Maricopa County support findings of the external operational review and the external financial audit conducted within the past two years. Benchmark figures are attached to allow for further analysis. Certain objective measures are key indicators of efficiency. For example:

- Tempe Municipal Court has the highest rate of filings per non-judicial court employee in Maricopa County.
- Tempe Municipal Court has the highest amount of filings per bench officer as comparable municipal courts in Maricopa County.
- Tempe Municipal Court ranks third in Maricopa County in terms of filings (behind Phoenix and Scottsdale).
- Tempe Municipal Court is the fourth largest municipal court in the state (after Phoenix, Tucson and Scottsdale) in terms of filings, yet is the ninth largest city in the State.
- Tempe Municipal Court's filings account for approximately 12.5 percent of the total municipal court filings in Maricopa County.
- Tempe Municipal Court has the second highest ratio of revenue to expenditures; 2.32:1 (\$2.32 in revenue for every \$1.00 spent for court operations).

- Tempe Municipal Court has the second lowest cost per filing of comparable courts (\$40 per filing) in Maricopa County (\$61).
- Tempe Municipal Court continues to have lower revenues per filing than all other courts, due in large part to the number of parking violations, which constitute some of the lowest assessed fine amounts.

COURT FILINGS FY 2005/2006

	<u>CRIMINAL TRAFFIC</u>	<u>MISDEMEANOR</u>	<u>CIVIL TRAFFIC</u>	<u>ORDINANCE</u>	<u>PROTECTIVE ORDERS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>% TO COUNTY</u>	<u>% TO STATE</u>
GLENDALE	8,237	8,623	31,242	1,559	2,552	52,213	5.22%	3.55%
CHANDLER	6,136	7,275	32,707	1,373	1,054	48,545	4.86%	3.30%
MESA	13,992	17,145	72,994	4,018	2,089	110,238	11.03%	7.50%
TEMPE	11,434	14,394	57,682	40,483	731	124,724	12.48%	8.49%
SCOTTSDALE	10,951	9,689	130,763	4,648	947	156,998	15.71%	10.68%
PHOENIX	54,485	37,615	213,366	40,128	3,027	348,621	34.88%	23.72%
MARICOPA CO	124,078	110,542	654,670	97,568	12,714	999,572	100.00%	68.01%
STATE OF ARIZONA	171,252	236,275	876,895	166,028	19,393	1,469,843	100.00%	100.00%

COURT REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES FY 2005/2006

	<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE PER FILING</u>	<u>EXPENDITURE PER FILING</u>	<u>\$ RATIO REVENUE TO EXPENDITURE</u>
CHANDLER	\$5,994,324	\$3,283,448	\$123	\$68	\$1.83:\$1
GLENDALE	\$6,223,298	\$4,135,403	\$119	\$79	\$1.50:\$1
TEMPE	\$11,449,342	\$4,948,116	\$92	\$40	\$2.31:\$1
SCOTTSDALE	\$15,818,774	\$5,243,280	\$101	\$33	\$3.02:\$1
MESA	\$13,824,948	\$6,257,419	\$125	\$57	\$2.21:\$1
PHOENIX	\$44,596,808	\$30,248,943	\$128	\$87	\$1.47:\$1
MARICOPA CO	\$116,988,511	\$63,852,083	\$117	\$64	\$1.83:\$1
STATE OF ARIZONA	\$160,381,682	\$88,592,664 ¹	\$109	\$60	\$1.82:\$1

COURT STAFFING Staffing figures were obtained directly from the courts as this information has not yet been reported to the Supreme Court

	<u>JUDGES</u>	<u>HEARING OFFICERS</u>	<u>NON-JUDICIAL STAFF</u>	<u>FILINGS PER JUDGE</u>	<u>FILINGS PER HEARING OFFICER</u>	<u>FILINGS PER BENCH OFFICER</u>	<u>FILINGS PER NON- JUDICIAL STAFF</u>
CHANDLER	4	1	38	3,353	34,080	9,709	1,278
GLENDALE	3	1	45	5,620	32,801	13,053	1,160
TEMPE	3	2	32	8,609	49,083	24,945	3,898
SCOTTSDALE	5	2	55	4,128	67,706	22,428	2,855
MESA	7	1	79	4,448	77,012	13,780	1,404
PHOENIX	22	4	347	4,186	63,374	13,409	1,005
MARICOPA CO.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
STATE OF ARIZONA							

COURT TRIALS AND HEARINGS

	<u>NON -JURY</u> <u>TRIALS</u>	<u>JURY TRIALS</u>	<u>PROTECTIVE</u> <u>ORDER</u> <u>HEARINGS</u>	<u>CIVIL</u> <u>HEARINGS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>TRIALS /</u> <u>HEARINGS</u>	<u>%</u> <u>FILINGS</u> <u>THAT GO</u> <u>TO TRIAL</u>	<u>% FILINGS</u> <u>THAT GO</u> <u>TO CIVIL</u> <u>HEARING</u>	<u>% FILINGS</u> <u>THAT GO TO</u> <u>TRIAL OR</u> <u>HEARING</u>
CHANDLER	1,155	16	280	1,039	2,490	8.73%	3.18%	5.13%
GLENDALE	56	3	323	347	729	0.35%	1.11%	1.40%
TEMPE	220	9	112	2,411	2,752	0.89%	4.18%	2.21%
SCOTTSDALE	286	42	165	1,560	2,053	1.59%	1.19%	1.31%
MESA	621	65	310	1,917	2,913	2.20%	2.63%	2.64%
PHOENIX	996	387	713	4,419	6,515	1.50%	2.07%	1.87%
MARICOPA CO	3,576	556	2333	13,772	20,237	1.76%	2.10%	2.02%
STATE OF ARIZONA	5,104	762	3,342	18,858	28,066	1.44%	2.15%	1.91%

NOTES: ¹Expenditures from 5 small rural courts not reported yet (St. Johns, Douglas, Globe, Miami, Winkelman)

Information not audited by AOC (Supreme Court) at this time.

This information is provided to the Supreme Court in accordance with annual reporting requirements.

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
WORKLOAD INDICATORS
FY 2005-2006

Activity	YTD	Avg/Mo	05/06 Proj	04/05 Tot	% Chg
Cases Filed	71,098	5,925	71,098	80,259	-11%
Charges Filed	86,592	7,216	86,592	98,927	-12%
Parking	39,483	3,290	39,483	43,035	-8%
Traffic & Misc.	37,287	3,107	37,287	45,919	-19%
Photo Radar	8,017	668	8,017	9,927	-19%
Speeding	7,508	626	7,508	9,202	-18%
Red Light	509	42	509	724	-30%
Arraignments	3,317	276	3,317	5,225	-37%
Courtroom 5	1,961	163	1,961	3,073	-36%
Final Adjudication	1,180	98	1,180	2,012	-41%
Courtroom 6	1,355	113	1,355	2,152	-37%
Final Adjudication	1,155	96	1,155	1,798	-36%
Motions	3,563	297	3,563	3,768	-5%
Courtroom 5	2,139	178	2,139	2,092	2%
Courtroom 6	1,424	119	1,424	1,676	-15%
Hearings	2,411	201	2,411	2,653	-9%
Courtroom 5	1,097	91	1,097	1,240	-12%
Courtroom 6	1,314	110	1,314	1,413	-7%
FTA Defaults	22,116	1,843	22,116	22,706	-3%
Appeals	20	2	20	21	-5%
Civil Correspondence Rec'd	37,434	3,120	37,434	48,596	-23%
Returned Mail	8,327	694	8,327	7,042	18%
DDS Completions	9,988	832	9,988	10,873	-8%
AZDDS	5,861	488	5,861	6,475	-9%
CRASH	1,665	139	1,665	n/a	N/A
NSC	2,552	213	2,552	4,398	-42%
DDS Continuances	2,405	200	2,405	2,762	-13%
AZDDS	962	80	962	1,156	-17%
CRASH	578	48	578	n/a	N/A
NSC	910	76	910	1,606	-43%
Bicycle Diversion Completions	151	13	151	86	76%
Summons and Complaints	23,466	1,956	23,466	19,776	19%
Complaints Issued	18,861	1,572	18,861	19,963	-6%
Complaints Reissued	4,900	408	4,900	319	1436%
Cashier Activity	41,676	3,473	41,676	39,959	4%
Mail Payments Posted	13,813	1,151	13,813	15,669	-12%
Financial Services Interviews	9,659	805	9,659	10,618	-9%
IVR Payments	18,627	1,552	18,627	17,993	4%
Lockbox Payments	16,489	1,374	16,489	19,584	-16%

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT
CRIMINAL DIVISION
WORKLOAD INDICATORS
FY 2005-2006

ACTIVITY	YTD	Avg/Mo	05/06 Proj	04-05 Tot	% Chg
CASES FILED	16,970	1,414	16,970	16,415	3%
CHARGES FILED	38,687	3,224	38,687	37,542	3%
PRISONERS	9,406	784	9,406	9,227	2%
COURTROOM #4 ACTIVITY	7,814	651	7,814	7,419	5%
JAIL ACTIVITY	1,592	133	1,592	1,808	-12%
INITIAL APPEARANCES (jail)	3,888	324	3,888	3,596	8%
ARRAIGNMENTS	4,968	414	4,968	4,316	15%
FINAL ADJUDICATION	1,487	124	1,487	1,323	12%
PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCES	6,108	509	6,108	5,551	10%
TRIALS	94	8	94	143	-34%
NON-JURY	94	8	94	134	-30%
JURY	0	0	0	9	-100%
PETITIONS FILED	386	32	386	311	24%
ORDER OF PROTECTION	252	21	252	195	29%
INJUNCTION PROHIBITING	134	11	134	116	16%
OTHER COURTROOM ACTIVITY*	1,906	159	1,906	1,900	0%
CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED	25,827	2,152	25,827	21,210	22%
RETURNED MAIL	3,640	303	3,640	2,763	32%
CERTIFIED MAIL	4,851	404	4,851	11,898	-59%
MOTIONS	22,576	1,881	22,576	19,642	15%
MTC STATE	3,230	269	3,230	2,260	43%
MTC DEFENSE	3,416	285	3,416	3,018	13%
MTC PRO PER	5,110	426	5,110	4,900	4%
MTC PUB DEF	704	59	704	807	-13%
MTD STATE	8,664	722	8,664	7,356	18%
MTD DEFENSE	134	11	134	95	41%
MTD PRO PER	46	4	46	20	130%
MTD PUB DEF	2	0	2	8	-800%
OTHER MOTIONS	2,259	188	2,259	2,085	8%
WARRANTS ISSUED	10,158	847	10,158	7,666	33%
APPEALS	32	3	32	19	68%

PROJECTED
CONSOLIDATED EXPENDITURES FOR ALL COST CENTERS
FY 2005/2006

ACCT #	ACCT DESC	1410	1411	1412	1400 ROLLUP	05/06 BUDGET	+ / - BUDGET
6201	OFFICE SUPPLIES	1,425.78	6,942.82	6,781.11	15,149.71	\$ 12,764.82	(2,384.89)
6305	CLOTHING	601.76	-	-	601.76	600.00	(1.76)
6351	MINOR EQUIPMENT	424.78	-	-	424.78	500.00	75.22
6370	PRINTING & COPY	492.04	10,453.52	5,500.97	16,446.53	18,000.00	1,553.47
6505	BOOKS & PUBLICATIONS	3,125.24	-	-	3,125.24	4,000.00	874.76
6513	FIRST AID	130.04	-	-	130.04	250.00	119.96
6514	AWARDS	1,158.99	-	-	1,158.99	1,000.00	(158.99)
6599	MISCELLANEOUS	1,162.50	-	-	1,162.50	1,000.00	(162.50)
TOTAL	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES	8,521.13	17,396.34	12,282.08	38,199.55	38,114.82	(84.73)
6656	CONSULTANTS -- Interpreters	-	5,236.91	2,221.00	7,457.91	7,493.00	35.09
6665	JURY FEES	-	15,097.97	-	15,097.97	19,081.00	3,983.03
6668	LEGAL FEES -- Pro Tems	97,299.00	-	-	97,299.00	110,000.00	12,701.00
6669	COLLECTION FEES	-	-	2,890.96	2,890.96	3,500.00	609.04
6670	PUBLIC DEFENDER FEES	205,440.98	-	-	205,440.98	181,437.50	(24,003.48)
6672	CONTRACTED SERVICES	-	2,997.00	529.74	3,526.74	2,716.00	(810.74)
6688	OFF-SITE STORAGE	1,228.80	-	-	1,228.80	1,129.00	(99.80)
6693	LAUNDRY	31.87	-	-	31.87	300.00	268.13
6694	INTERPRETERS	-	6,070.00	490.00	6,560.00	9,300.00	2,740.00
6701	CELL PHONE CHARGES	-	-	-	-	-	0.00
6702	TELECOMMUNICATION SVCS-Pagers	849.37	-	-	849.37	900.00	50.63
6704	POSTAGE	36.17	-	-	36.17	125.00	88.83
6716	MEMBERSHIP & SUBSCRIPTION	3,923.50	-	-	3,923.50	3,901.00	(22.50)
6753	OUTSIDE PRINTING	800.59	7,836.44	2,360.02	10,997.05	12,950.00	1,952.95
6755	DUPLICATING	-	2,056.53	2,048.78	4,105.31	3,000.00	(1,105.31)
6856	EQUIPMENT REPAIR	484.79	454.02	596.64	1,535.45	2,075.00	539.55
6906	EQUIPMENT RENTAL	-	4,515.35	4,068.08	8,583.43	11,500.00	2,916.57
6990	LICENSES	36.00	-	-	36.00	-	(36.00)
TOTAL	FEES & SERVICES	310,131.07	44,264.22	15,205.22	369,600.51	369,407.50	(193.01)
7401	TRAINING & SEMINAR	2,259.00	-	-	2,259.00	3,120.00	861.00
7403	TRAVEL EXPENSES	4,025.70	-	-	4,025.70	4,426.00	400.30
7404	LOCAL MEETINGS	323.58	-	-	323.58	\$ 760.00	436.42
TOTAL	TRAINING & SEMINAR	6,608.28	-	-	6,608.28	8,306.00	1,697.72
TOTAL	TOTAL BY COST CENTER	325,260.48	61,660.56	27,487.30	414,408.34	415,828.32	1,419.98

OVER /
UNDER BGT \$1,419.98

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT
REVENUE SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006

ACCT # AND DESCRIPTION	PRIOR FY ACTUAL	CURRENT YTD REVENUES	% PROJ VS PRIOR FY ACTUAL	DIFFERENCE (CURRENT FY PROJ - PRIOR FY ACTUAL)
4601 PARKING FINES	635,449.81	620,260.32	(0.02)	(15,189.49)
4602 TRAFFIC FINES	1,684,478.68	1,711,007.41	0.02	26,528.73
4603 CRIMINAL FINES	1,154,702.82	1,292,654.91	0.12	137,952.09
4604 PUBLIC DEFENDER FEES	61,391.59	66,746.07	0.09	5,354.48
4605 FORFEITURES	176,291.35	241,122.60	0.37	64,831.25
4607 NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCEMENT	32,524.00	40,786.98	0.25	8,262.98
4609 ANIMAL CONTROL	-	-		0.00
4612 DDS COURT DIVERSION	450,804.00	416,297.00	(0.08)	(34,507.00)
4616 SMOKING ORDINANCE FINES	-	60.00		
4617 DDS OUT OF STATE DIVERSION	2,430.00	3,046.00	0.25	616.00
4621 DEFAULT FEES	374,911.66	390,810.64	0.04	15,898.98
4624 BOOT FEES / PARKING	1,520.00	6,585.50	3.33	5,065.50
4627 COUNTY JAIL FEE	277,012.31	360,873.85	0.30	83,861.54
4628 COPIES AND TAPES	29,695.49	21,033.50	(0.29)	(8,661.99)
4636 PROCESS SERVICE	10,412.22	9,923.00	(0.05)	(489.22)
4640 SURETY BOND FORFEITURES	10,600.00	11,350.00	0.07	750.00
4642 REINSPECTION FEE/NBR ENH	-	-		
4643 RENTAL HOUSING CODE FINE	50.00	187.92		137.92
4648 CONTEMPT CHARGES	100.00	-		(100.00)
4653 CITY JAIL FEE	87,030.00	120,881.70		33,851.70
4935 CASH OVER / SHORT	463.43	704.52	0.52	241.09
4949 OTHER	1,709.40	12,922.95	6.56	11,213.55
TOTAL	4,967,320.60	5,313,627.40	0.07	346,306.80
ACCT # AND DESCRIPTION	PRIOR FY ACTUAL	CURRENT YTD REVENUES	% PROJ VS ACT	DIFFERENCE (CFYP - PFYA)
4641 PUBLIC SAFETY ENHANCEMENT FUND	450,577.43	433,996.43	0.16	70,218.29
4634 28-2533 20% TO PD (Cost Center 2210)		570.75		
4637 28-4139 100% TO GENERAL FUND		48,079.39		
ACCT # AND DESCRIPTION	CURRENT FY PROJECTED	CURRENT YTD REVENUES	% PROJ VS ACT	DIFFERENCE (CFYP - PFYA)
4632 COURT USER FEE (CEF)	456,589.83	441,074.11	0.16	72,699.10
4851 INTEREST ACCRUED	18,354.90	52,036.11	2.40	44,088.43
4853 GAIN / LOSS ON INVESTMENT				0.00
TOTAL	474,944.73	478,481.69	0.21	99,233.30

Four-year Information Technology Financial Summary

Revenues:	FY2006/2007	FY2007/2008	FY2008/2009	FY2009/2010
Balance Carryover:	\$ 597,330	\$ 540,850	\$ 777,350	\$ 919,850
Projected Revenues:	\$ 484,980	\$ 480,000	\$ 480,000	\$ 480,000
Sub Total:	\$ 1,082,310	\$ 1,020,850	\$ 1,257,350	\$ 1,399,850
EXPENDITURES:	FY2006/2007	FY2007/2008	FY2008/2009	FY2009/2010
FY 07 Expenditures through 12/31/06	\$ 76,260			
Case Management System Development - Programming	\$ 130,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Case Management System Development System - Hardware	\$ 150,000			
Case Management System Development System - Software	\$ 55,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
IVR Maintenance Agreement, Annual Costs	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000
MiniSoft ODBC Maintenance, Annual Costs	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
TAB Maintenance Agreement, Annual Costs	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
InFax Calendar Display Maintenance, Annual Cost beg. 07/08		\$ 10,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000
Police Radios for Panic Alarms, Annual Costs	\$ 13,700			
WENDELL Connection to Supreme Court T1 Line, Annual Costs	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
E-government for Court			\$ 45,000	
Check payments by telephone			\$ 20,000	
Electronic TF of Funds for those on contracts			\$ 20,000	
Assisted Listening Devices (7 courtrooms)	\$ 21,000			
Document Imaging integrated w/case mgmt system			\$ 25,000	
Public Access to case mgmt system via Internet			\$ 20,000	
On-line Jury deferral via Internet and IVR deferral				\$ 17,500
E-Filing of Court documents				\$ 40,000
Video Conference system w/jail for IA, Arrn, etc.				\$ 35,000
Fingerprint Scanners for Crim. Divisions, Imaging Proj.		\$ 25,000	\$20,000	
Federal Tax Intercept Program Interface				\$ 20,000
Appeals, electronic interface w/Superior Court				\$ 15,000
Civil Traffic arraignments via Internet				\$ 25,000
Bar Coding			\$20,000	\$ 15,000
Database License/Maintenance	\$ 80,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
TOTAL EXPENSES:	\$ 541,460	\$ 243,500	\$ 337,500	\$ 310,000
TOTAL REVENUES:	\$ 1,082,310	\$ 1,020,850	\$ 1,257,350	\$ 1,399,850
BALANCE:	\$ 540,850	\$ 777,350	\$ 919,850	\$ 1,089,850

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT
Single Point of Entry
Security Statistics
Fiscal Year 2006

																		COUNTS	
DATE	MACE	KNIVES	RAZOR BLADES	TOOLS	CAN OPENERS	BOX CUTTERS	SCISSORS	NAIL FILES	GUNS	HAND CUFFS/ KEYS	NEEDLES	CHAINS	PICKS	AMMO	MAGS	MISC. ITEMS	TOTAL ITEMS	PERSONS	ALARM
JUL	22	203	19	57	1	30	33	6	1	7	0	16	0	1	0	51	447	14391	7743
AUG	17	214	26	82	1	28	26	11	0	12	0	9	0	0	0	55	481	16303	8793
SEPT	16	195	22	99	1	27	19	5	0	20	0	6	0	0	0	73	483	15002	8416
OCT	21	177	11	102	2	23	28	3	0	22	0	5	1	15	2	64	476	14280	8275
NOV	24	168	19	135	0	33	21	5	0	7	0	15	0	1	0	56	484	13619	7939
DEC	18	191	25	71	2	13	21	5	0	4	0	6	0	0	0	58	414	12984	7920
JAN	10	226	12	108	0	29	27	12	0	7	0	11	0	0	0	68	510	14808	9069
FEB	22	192	26	54	0	25	25	13	0	11	0	14	0	0	0	50	432	13932	8470
MARCH	12	186	10	88	0	24	24	3	0	19	0	18	0	0	0	32	416	15180	9245
APRIL	13	185	61	93	0	28	25	4	1	15	4	13	1	0	0	55	498	13290	7790
MAY	15	184	11	90	1	26	29	5	0	12	1	13	0	0	0	61	421	14535	8154
JUNE	12	161	12	89	0	28	33	4	0	10	0	8	1	0	0	49	407	14506	8101
2005-2006																			
TOTALS	202	2282	254	1068	8	314	311	76	2	146	5	134	3	17	2	672	5469	172,830	99,915
AVG/MO	17	190	21	89	1	26	26	6	0	12	0	11	0	1	0	56	456	14403	8326
04-05 TOTAL	208	2,896	149	1,072	23	272	389	51	14	140	6	198	6	5	0	791	6,185	174,626	102,710